arXiv:1212.5968v1 [math.AP] 24 Dec 2012

On Axially Symmetric Incompressible Magnetohydrodynamics in Three Dimensions

Zhen Lei [*]

December 27, 2012

Abstract

The global regularity for the incompressible magnetohydrodynamic equations (MHD) in three dimensions is a long standing open problem of fluid dynamics and PDE theory. The Navier-Stokes equations can be viewed as a special case of MHD with a constant magnetic field, whose global regularity problem is known as a Clay Millennium Prize Problem. In this article, we prove the global regularity of axially symmetric solutions to the ideal MHD in three dimensions for a family of non-trivial magnetic fields. The proofs are based on the special structures of MHD and can of course also applied to the resistive MHD. Our result might indicate that there are richer fantastic research topics in MHD than Navier-Stokes equations.

Keywords: Magnetohydrodynamics, global regularity, axial symmetry.

1 Introduction

Magnetohydrodynamics (MHD) is to study the behavior of an electrically-conducting fluids. Examples of such fluids include plasmas, liquid metals, salt water, etc. The field of MHD was initiated by Hannes Alfvén, for which he received the Nobel Prize in Physics in 1970. However, the mathematical theory on MHD is still very little known until today.

The fundamental concept behind MHD is that magnetic fields can induce currents in a moving conductive fluid, which in turn creates forces on the fluid and also changes the magnetic field itself. MHD owes its peculiar interest and difficulty to this interaction between the field and the fluid motion. The set of equations which describe MHD are a combination of the Navier-Stokes equations of fluid dynamics and Maxwell's equations of electromagnetism.

We focus on the incompressible case. Let $\mathbf{B}$ denote the magnetic field, $\mathbf{E}$ the electric field, $\mathbf{u}$ the bulk plasma velocity, $\mathbf{J}$ the current density, p the plasma pressure and $\mu \geq 0$ the fluid viscosity. The momentum equation is

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla p = \mu \Delta \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{B}. \tag{1.1}$$

The ideal Ohm's law for a plasma is given by

$$\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{B} = 0.$$

---

[*] School of Mathematical Sciences; LMNS and Shanghai Key Laboratory for Contemporary Applied Mathematics, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, P. R. China. Email: leizhn@gmail.com

Faraday's law is

$$\partial_t \mathbf{B} = -\nabla \times \mathbf{E}.$$

In an imperfectly conducting fluid the magnetic field can generally move through the fluid following a diffusion law with the resistivity of the plasma serving as a diffusion constant. This includes an extra term in Ohm's Law and gives the resistive MHD. The Faraday's law in this case reads

$$\partial_t \mathbf{B} = \nabla \times (\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{B}) + \nu \Delta \mathbf{B}. \tag{1.2}$$

Here $\nu \geq 0$ is the resistivity. The low-frequency Ampere's law neglects displacement current and is given by

$$\mathbf{J} = \frac{1}{\mu_0} \nabla \times \mathbf{B}. \tag{1.3}$$

Here $\mu_0 > 0$ is the magnetic constant. The incompressibility and the magnetic divergence constraints are

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0, \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0. \tag{1.4}$$

The MHD is a combination of (1.1), (1.2), (1.3) and (1.4) (see, for instance, [9]).

In this paper, we are going to make a preliminary study on the global well-posedness of general solutions to MHD equations. Our main result concerns the following three-dimensional ideal MHD:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \mathbf{u} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u} + \nabla p = \Delta \mathbf{u} + (\nabla \times \mathbf{B}) \times \mathbf{B}, \\ \partial_t \mathbf{B} = \nabla \times (\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{B}), \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0, \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0. \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

We have set the constant μ_0 and μ to be 1. For the ideal MHD, the fluid has so little resistivity that it can be treated as a perfect conductor. This is the limit of infinite magnetic Reynolds number. For applications of ideal MHD, see, for instance, [4].

We will show the global existence of classical solutions to the 3D incompressible ideal MHD in the axially symmetric case for a class of non-trivial magnetic fields. The theorem is stated as follows:

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that* $\mathbf{u}_0$ *and* $\mathbf{B}_0$ *are both axially symmetric divergence-free vectors with* $u_0^\theta = 0$ *and* $B_0^r = B_0^z = 0$*. Moreover, we assume that* $(\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{B}_0) \in H^s$ *with* $s \geq 2$ *and* $\frac{B_0^\theta}{r} \in L^\infty$*. Then there exists a unique global solution* $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{B})$ *for the ideal MHD* (1.5) *with the initial data* $(\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{B}_0)$ *which satisfies*

$$\|\mathbf{u}(t,\cdot)\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\mathbf{B}(t,\cdot)\|_{H^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{H^2}^2 ds \lesssim e^{e^{e^{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}}}.$$

The notations used here can be found in section 2. Note that the Paraday's equation for $\mathbf{B}$ in (1.5) is exactly the same as the vorticity equation for the 3D incompressible Euler equations (by identifying $\mathbf{B}$ and $\nabla \times \mathbf{u}$). This may lead to an essential difficulties for the global well-posedness of the ideal MHD (1.5) in general case. Indeed, the global regularity of (1.5) is even widely open in the two-dimensional case if the magnetic field is non-trivial. We achieve Theorem 1.5 by exploring the underlying special structures of the MHD system in axially symmetric case. The magnetic stretching term $\mathbf{B}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{u}$ in Paraday's equation can be absorbed into the convection term by dividing the equation by r. This yields that $\Pi=\frac{B^\theta}{r}$ is only transported by the velocity field $\mathbf{u}$. On the other hand, by dividing r in the vorticity equation, one can absorb the vortex stretching term into the convection term, leaving only one term involving Π as a forcing one in Ω equation.

The above result is motivated by a novelty observation on the following resistive MHD:

$$\begin{cases}\partial_t\mathbf{u}+(\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{u}+\nabla p=\Delta\mathbf{u}+(\nabla\times\mathbf{B})\times\mathbf{B},\\ \partial_t\mathbf{B}=\Delta\mathbf{B}+\nabla\times(\mathbf{u}\times\mathbf{B}),\\ \nabla\cdot\mathbf{u}=0,\quad \nabla\cdot\mathbf{B}=0.\end{cases}\tag{1.6}$$

Here we have set all the constants μ_0, μ, ν to be 1. We have the following theorem:

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that $\mathbf{u}_0$ and $\mathbf{B}_0$ are both axially symmetric divergence-free vectors with $u_0^\theta=0$ and $B_0^r=B_0^z=0$. Moreover, we assume that $(\mathbf{u}_0,\mathbf{B}_0)\in H^1$ and $\frac{B_0^\theta}{r}\in L^\infty$. Then there exists a unique global solution $(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{B})$ for the resistive MHD (1.6) with the initial data $(\mathbf{u}_0,\mathbf{B}_0)$. Moreover, $(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{B})$ is smooth in the sense that $(\mathbf{u}(t,\cdot),\mathbf{B}(t,\cdot))\in H^s$ for any $s\geq 0$ and $t>0$.*

As is well-known that any smooth solution of 3D Navier-Stokes equations is automatically a solution of MHD. In particular, the solution to 3D axially symmetric Navier-Stokes equations without swirl (see [8, 17]) also solves 3D MHD. However, we believe that there are richer structures in the case of MHD so that there are more examples of global solutions to MHD equation. For instance, $\mathbf{u}=\mathbf{B}=e^{t\Delta}\mathbf{u}_0$ is a solution of (1.6) with the associated pressure $p=-\frac{|\mathbf{B}|^2}{2}$. The above Theorem 1.6 gives another solution to (1.6) with axially symmetric initial data whose magnetic field is non-trivial. Our result might indicate that there are richer fantastic research topics in MHD than Navier-Stokes equations. We hope that this could initiate further study on this topics along this line of research.

Our key observation is that if we rewrite the 3D incompressible axially symmetric Navier-Stokes equations in terms of $\mathbf{u}=u^r\mathbf{e}_r+u^z\mathbf{e}_z$ and $\mathbf{b}=u^\theta\mathbf{e}_\theta$, then there is only a sign difference[1] between the Navier-Stokes equations (2.9) for $(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{b})$ and the resistive MHD (1.6) for $(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{B})$ (see Remark 2.1 in section 2 for details). As a consequence, there is an extra maximum principle for the quantity Π of the resistive MHD (1.6), while for Navier-Stokes equations, the maximum principle only holds for the quantity $\Gamma=ru^\theta$. This sign difference finally results in the global well-posedness in Theorem 1.6 for 3D MHD, while the corresponding problem for 3D Navier-Stokes equations is still widely open.

At last, let us consider the perfect resistive MHD:

$$\begin{cases}\partial_t\mathbf{u}+(\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{u}+\nabla p=(\nabla\times\mathbf{B})\times\mathbf{B},\\ \partial_t\mathbf{B}=\Delta\mathbf{B}+\nabla\times(\mathbf{u}\times\mathbf{B}),\\ \nabla\cdot\mathbf{u}=0,\quad \nabla\cdot\mathbf{B}=0.\end{cases}\tag{1.7}$$

Unfortunately, at present, we are unable to establish a global regularity result for (1.7) under similar settings as in Theorem 1.5 and Theorem 1.6. But we can prove the existence of weak solutions. We remark that such a result in the general case is also widely open. Our theorem is:

---

[1] In fact, the pressure is also changed. But the pressure is not a troublesome term for our purpose due to the divergence-free condition.

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose that* $\mathbf{u}_0$ *and* $\mathbf{B}_0$ *are both axially symmetric divergence-free vectors with* $u_0^\theta = 0$ *and* $B_0^r = B_0^z = 0$*. Moreover, we assume that* $\mathbf{u}_0 \in H^1 \cap W^{2,\frac{3}{2}}$, $\mathbf{B}_0 \in H^1$ *and* $\frac{B_0^\theta}{r} \in L^2 \cap L^\infty$*. Then there exists a global weak solution* $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{B}) \in L^\infty(0, \infty; L^2)$ *for the perfect resistive MHD* (1.6) *with the initial data* $(\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{B_0})$*.*

Due to Theorem 1.2, it is expected that we can get a family of approximated solutions by adding the viscous term $\epsilon\Delta\mathbf{u}$ into the momentum equations and then apply the viscosity vanishing method to yield the desired weak solutions to (1.7). The point is to get enough *a priori* estimate so that we can deal with the Lorentz forcing term when taking the limit $\epsilon \to 0$. For a technical reason, we require that the initial data have relatively high regularity. It is possible to obtain the result under less regularity of initial data, but we don't pursue that in this paper.

Before ending the introduction, let us mention some important results in the field of incompressible MHD. The local well-posedness of the resistive MHD (1.6) was established in [13] where the authors also proved the global well-posedness in 2D case. A nontrivial blowup criterion for the perfect resistive MHD (1.7) was established in terms of only $L_t^1(\mathrm{BMO})$ norm of vorticity of the velocity field in [10]. Recently, Lin, Xu and Zhang [11] made an important progress on the global well-posedness of classical solutions for the 2D ideal MHD (1.5) under the assumption that the initial velocity field and the displacement of the magnetic field from a non-zero constant is sufficiently small in appropriate Sobolev spaces. Cao and Wu [2] proved the global regularity of 2D resistive MHD with partial viscosity and resistivity. We also emphasis the partial regularity theory and Serrin type criterions in [5, 6], and various blowup criterions in [1, 3] (see also the reference therein).

The remaining of this paper is simply organized as follows: In section 2 we will derive the axisymmetric MHD in cylindrical coordinate. We will also make a comment on the difference between the resistive MHD (1.6) and the axially symmetric Navier-Stokes equations and prove a maximum principle for Π. We will prove Theorem 1.1 in section 3. In section 4 we present the proofs for Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3.

Acknowledgement. The author would like to thank professor FangHua Lin, professor Horng-Tzer Yau and professor Shing-Tung Yau for their interest in this work.

2 Axially Symmetric MHD and A Maximum Principle

In this section we will first derive the incompressible axially symmetric MHD in cylindrical coordinate. Then we show that the quantity Π satisfies a maximum principle. We also present an interesting connection between the axisymmetric MHD studied in Theorem 1.2 with the axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations with non-trivial swirl u^θ (see (2.6) and (2.9)).

Let us begin with some notations. A point in $\mathbb{R}^3$ is denoted by $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, z)$. Let $r = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}$ and

$$\mathbf{e}_r = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{x_1}{r} \\ \frac{x_2}{r} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{e}_\theta = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{x_2}{r} \\ \frac{x_1}{r} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{e}_z = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

be the three orthogonal unit vectors along the radial, the angular, and the axial directions respectively. An axially symmetric solution to the 3D incompressible MHD (1.6) is a solution $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{B}, p)$ which takes the following form

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{u}(t, \mathbf{x}) = u^r(t, r, z)\mathbf{e}_r + u^\theta(t, r, z)\mathbf{e}_\theta + u^z(t, r, z)\mathbf{e}_z, \\ \mathbf{B}(t, \mathbf{x}) = B^r(t, r, z)\mathbf{e}_r + B^\theta(t, r, z)\mathbf{e}_\theta + B^z(t, r, z)\mathbf{e}_z, \\ p(t, \mathbf{x}) = p(t, r, z). \end{cases}$$

We will also write the vorticity field $\nabla \times \mathbf{u}$ in cylindrical coordinate:

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{u}(t, \mathbf{x}) = \omega^r(t, r, z)\mathbf{e}_r + \omega^\theta(t, r, z)\mathbf{e}_\theta + \omega^z(t, r, z)\mathbf{e}_z,$$

where

$$\omega^r = -\partial_z u^\theta, \quad \omega^\theta = \partial_z u^r - \partial_r u^z, \quad \omega^z = \frac{1}{r}\partial_r(r u^\theta).$$

Define

$$\Pi = \frac{h^\theta}{r}, \quad \Omega = \frac{\omega^\theta}{r}, \quad \Gamma = r u^\theta. \tag{2.1}$$

By expanding the Lorentz force term as

$$(\nabla \times \mathbf{B}) \times \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{B} - \frac{|\mathbf{B}|^2}{2},$$

and then taking the inner product of $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ equations with $\mathbf{e_r}$, $\mathbf{e}_\theta$ and $\mathbf{e_z}$, respectively, we can derive the resistive MHD in cylindrical coordinate:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u^r + u^r \partial_r u^r + u^z \partial_z u^r - \frac{(u^\theta)^2}{r} + \partial_r P \\ \qquad = \big(\Delta - \frac{1}{r^2}\big) u^r + B^r \partial_r B^r + B^z \partial_z B^r - \frac{(B^\theta)^2}{r}, \\ \partial_t u^\theta + u^r \partial_r u^\theta + u^z \partial_z u^\theta + \frac{u^r u^\theta}{r} \\ \qquad = \big(\Delta - \frac{1}{r^2}\big) u^\theta + B^r \partial_r B^\theta + B^z \partial_z B^\theta + \frac{B^r B^\theta}{r}, \\ \partial_t u^z + u^r \partial_r u^z + u^z \partial_z u^z + \partial_z P \\ \qquad\qquad = \Delta u^z + B^r \partial_r B^z + B^z \partial_z B^z, \\ \partial_t B^r + u^r \partial_r B^r + u^z \partial_z B^r \\ \qquad = \big(\Delta - \frac{1}{r^2}\big) B^r + B^r \partial_r u^r + B^z \partial_z u^r, \\ \partial_t B^\theta + u^r \partial_r B^\theta + B^z \partial_z u^\theta + \frac{B^r u^\theta}{r} \\ \qquad = \big(\Delta - \frac{1}{r^2}\big) u^\theta + B^r \partial_r u^\theta + B^z \partial_z u^\theta + \frac{u^r B^\theta}{r}, \\ \partial_t B^z + u^r \partial_r B^z + u^z \partial_z B^z \\ \qquad = \Delta B^z + B^r \partial_r u^z + B^z \partial_z u^z, \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

where the pressure is given by

$$P = p + \frac{|\mathbf{B}|^2}{2}. \tag{2.3}$$

The incompressible constraints are

$$\partial_r u^r + \frac{u^r}{r} + \partial_z u^z = 0, \quad \partial_r B^r + \frac{B^r}{r} + \partial_z B^z = 0. \tag{2.4}$$

The general axially symmetric resistive MHD is governed by (2.2) and (2.4). In this paper, we consider a family of solutions with the form

$$\mathbf{u}(t,\mathbf{x}) = u^r(t,r,z)\mathbf{e}_r + u^z(t,r,z)\mathbf{e}_z, \quad \mathbf{B}(t,\mathbf{x}) = B^\theta(t,r,z)\mathbf{e}_\theta. \tag{2.5}$$

It is easy to check that (u^θ, B^r, B^z) can be zero for all time if they are zero initially. In this case, $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{B}, P)$ in (2.5) and (2.3) is governed by

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u^r + u^r\partial_r u^r + u^z\partial_z u^r + \partial_r P = \big(\Delta - \frac{1}{r^2}\big)u^r - \frac{(B^\theta)^2}{r}, \\ \partial_t u^z + u^r\partial_r u^z + u^z\partial_z u^z + \partial_z P = \Delta u^z, \\ \partial_t B^\theta + u^r\partial_r B^\theta + u^z\partial_z B^\theta = \big(\Delta - \frac{1}{r^2}\big)B^\theta + \frac{u^r B^\theta}{r}, \end{cases} \tag{2.6}$$

together with the incompressible constraint

$$\partial_r u^r + \frac{u^r}{r} + \partial_z u^z = 0. \tag{2.7}$$

To avoid the explicit presence of pressure, we also need the vorticity formula of (2.6):

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t B^\theta + u^r\partial_r B^\theta + u^z\partial_z B^\theta = \big(\Delta - \frac{1}{r^2}\big)B^\theta + \frac{u^r B^\theta}{r}, \\ \partial_t \omega^\theta + u^r\partial_r \omega^\theta + u^z\partial_z \omega^\theta + \frac{u^r\omega^\theta}{r} = \big(\Delta - \frac{1}{r^2}\big)\omega^\theta - \frac{\partial_z (B^\theta)^2}{r}. \end{cases} \tag{2.8}$$

Remark 2.1. It is well-known that the axially symmetric Navier-Stokes equations (in the case of $\mathbf{B} \equiv 0$) are (see, for instance, [12])

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u^r + u^r\partial_r u^r + u^z\partial_z u^r + \partial_r p = \big(\Delta - \frac{1}{r^2}\big)u^r + \frac{(u^\theta)^2}{r}, \\ \partial_t u^z + u^r\partial_r u^z + u^z\partial_z u^z + \partial_z p = \Delta u^z, \\ \partial_t u^\theta + u^r\partial_r u^\theta + u^z\partial_z u^\theta = \big(\Delta - \frac{1}{r^2}\big)u^\theta - \frac{u^r u^\theta}{r}. \end{cases}$$

If we denote $\mathbf{u} = u^r\mathbf{e}_r + u^z\mathbf{e}_z$ and $\mathbf{b} = u^\theta\mathbf{e}_\theta$, we can rewrite the above axially symmetric Navier-Stokes equations as

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{u} + \nabla p = \Delta\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{b}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{b}, \\ \partial_t \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{b} = \Delta\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{b}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{u}, \\ \nabla\cdot\mathbf{u} = \nabla\cdot\mathbf{b} = 0. \end{cases} \tag{2.9}$$

If we compare the MHD equations (1.6) with the Navier-Stokes equations (2.9), we find that we can recover (1.6) from (2.9) by changing the sign of the terms $\mathbf{b}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{b}$ and $\mathbf{b}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{u}$. The significance of the tiny difference, especially, the sign of $\mathbf{b}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{u}$, yields a much stronger *a priori* estimate in the MHD case.

Proposition 2.1 (Maximum Principle)**.** *Assume that* $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{B}, P)$ *is a smooth solution to* (2.6) *with or without resistivity and* $|\Pi(t,r,z)| \to 0$ *as* $r + |z| \to \infty$ *for each fixed* $t > 0$*. Then the quantity* Π *satisfies the maximum principle*

$$\|\Pi(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \le \|\Pi(0,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty}, \quad \forall\, t \ge 0.$$

Proof. Let us first consider the case of zero resistivity. By dividing the equation for B^θ by r, one has

$$\partial_t\Pi + u^r\partial_r\Pi + u^z\partial_z\Pi = 0. \tag{2.10}$$

Since all functions are axially symmetric, we can write (2.10) as

$$\partial_t\Pi + \mathrm{u}\cdot\nabla\Pi = 0,$$

which gives the maximum principle for Π in the case of zero resistivity.

Similarly, in the resistive case, we have

$$\partial_t\Pi + u^r\partial_r\Pi + u^z\partial_z\Pi = (\partial_r^2 + \frac{3}{r}\partial_r + \partial_z^2)\Pi. \tag{2.11}$$

Clearly, for smooth solutions, one has $\Pi(t,0,z) \equiv 0$ for all time. Consequently, $|\Pi|$ can not reach its maximum on the axis $r = 0$ if it is not identically zero. Suppose that $|\Pi(t_0, r_0, z_0)| = \sup_{0\le t\le t_0}\|\Pi(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty}$ at some $t_0 > 0$. Then one must have $r_0 > 0$. Now one can restrict the equation (2.11) on the domain

$$Q_\epsilon = \big\{(t,\mathbf{x}) : 0 \le t \le t_0, \quad \epsilon \le r_0 \le \frac{1}{\epsilon}, |z - z_0| \le \frac{1}{\epsilon}\big\}.$$

By viewing (2.11) as a five-dimensional draft-diffusion equation, we conclude by strong maximum principle that $\Pi \equiv \|\Pi(0,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty}$ on Q_ϵ. Taking $\epsilon \to 0$, one has $\Pi \equiv \|\Pi(0,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty}$ for all $0 \le t \le t_0$. Since $\Pi(t,0,z) \equiv 0$, one in fact has $\Pi(t,\cdot) \equiv 0$ for all time, which contradicts to the fact that Π doesn't vanish identically. Hence, one has $\|\Gamma(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty} < \|\Gamma(0,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty}$ for any $t > 0$.

□

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1. Throughout this paper, we will use $A_1 \lesssim A_2$ to denote that $A_1 \le C_0A_2$ and $A_1 \simeq A_2$ to denote that $C_0^{-1}A_2 \le A_1 \le C_0A_2$ for a generic positive constant $C_0 > 1$ and two positive quantities A_1 and A_2.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let us rewrite the vorticity equation in (2.8) in terms of Ω:

$$\partial_t\Omega + u^r\partial_r\Omega + u^z\partial_z\Omega = (\partial_r^2 + \frac{3}{r}\partial_r + \partial_z^2)\Omega - \partial_z\Pi^2.$$

By taking the L^2 inner product of the above equation with Ω and preforming the standard energy estimate, one has

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|\Omega\|_{L^2}^2 - \int \Omega(\partial_r^2 + \frac{3}{r}\partial_r + \partial_z^2)\Omega dx\\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\int(u^r\partial_r\Omega^2 + u^z\partial_z\Omega^2)dx - \int \Omega\partial_z\Pi^2 dx.\end{aligned}$$

Using the incompressibility condition (2.7) and the fact of $dx = 2\pi r dr dz$, one has

$$\int (u^r \partial_r \Omega^2 + u^z \partial_z \Omega^2) dx = 0$$

and

$$-\int \Omega(\partial_r^2 + \frac{3}{r}\partial_r + \partial_z^2)\Omega dx = \|\nabla \Omega\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\pi \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\Omega(t, 0, z)|^2 dz.$$

By integration by part and interpolation, we have

$$\Big|\int \Omega \partial_z \Pi^2 dx\Big| \le \|\Pi\|_{L^4}^2 \|\partial_z \Omega\|_{L^2} \le \frac{1}{2}\|\Pi\|_{L^2}^2 \|\Pi\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\partial_z \Omega\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Consequently, one has

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\Omega\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \Omega\|_{L^2}^2 \le \|\Pi\|_{L^2}^2 \|\Pi\|_{L^\infty}^2. \tag{3.1}$$

Similarly, using equation (2.11) and preforming the L^2 energy estimate, one has

$$\|\Pi(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} \le \|\Pi_0\|_{L^2}, \quad \forall\ t \ge 0. \tag{3.2}$$

Consequently, by Proposition 2.1 and using (3.1), (3.2), we have

$$\|\Omega(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} \lesssim 1 + \sqrt{t}, \quad \int_0^t \|\nabla \Omega\|_{L^2}^2 dt \lesssim 1 + t, \quad \forall\ t \ge 0. \tag{3.3}$$

Here we used that $\Omega_0 \in L^2$ which is due to the fact that $\mathbf{u}_0 \in H^2$ and

$$\big|\nabla(\nabla \times \mathbf{u})\big|^2 = \big|(\mathbf{e}_r \partial_r + \frac{1}{r}\mathbf{e}_\theta \partial_\theta + \mathbf{e}_z \partial_z)\omega^\theta \mathbf{e}_\theta\big|^2 = |\nabla \omega^\theta|^2 + |\Omega|^2.$$

Similarly, one also has $\Pi_0 \in L^2$ since $\mathbf{B}_0 \in H^1$ which is also used.

To proceed, we need a technical lemma regarding the property of a Riesz operator on $\mathbb{R}^3$. We first recall the following weighted Calderon-Zygmund inequality for a singular integral operator with a weight function which is in the $\mathcal{A}_p$ class (see Stein [14] pp. 194-217 for details). Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a Riesz operator in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $w(x)$ be a weight in the $\mathcal{A}_p$ class (see page 194 of [14] for definition). One can extend the Calderon-Zygmund inequality for the singular integral operator with the integral having weight function $w(x)$. Specifically, for $1 < p < \infty$, there holds

$$\|\mathcal{K} f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}, \quad \forall\ \ f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

The following lemma plays an essential role in our global regularity analysis.

Lemma 3.1. *There holds*

$$\int_0^T \|r^{-1} u^r(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} dt \lesssim \sup_{0 \le t \le T} \|\Omega(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^T \|\nabla \Omega(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} dt.$$

Remark 3.2. We pointed out that in [7] the authors have established an inequality $\|r^{-1}\partial_z u^r\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|\Omega\|_{L^p}$ for $1 < p < \infty$ for $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{T}^1$, where $\mathbb{T}^1$ is a one-dimensional torus.

Proof. We follow the proof in [7]. By the incompressible constraint (2.7), we can introduce the angular stream function ψ^θ such that

$$-\big(\partial_r^2+\frac{1}{r}\partial_r-\frac{1}{r^2}+\partial_z^2\big)\psi^\theta=\omega^\theta, \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$u^r=-\partial_z\psi^\theta,\quad u^z=\frac{1}{r}\partial_r(r\psi^\theta).$$

We divide by r in (3.4), which gives that

$$-\big(\partial_r^2+\frac{3}{r}\partial_r+\partial_z^2\big)\frac{\psi^\theta}{r}=\frac{\omega^\theta}{r}. \tag{3.5}$$

Following [7], we interpret the Laplace operator in (3.5) as a five-dimensional one. We formally write

$$y=(y_1,y_2,y_3,y_4,z),\quad r=\sqrt{y_1^2+y_2^2+y_3^2+y_4^2},\quad \Delta_y=\big(\partial_r^2+\frac{3}{r}\partial_r+\partial_z^2\big).$$

This way we have $\frac{\psi^\theta}{r}=(-\Delta_y)^{-1}\frac{\omega^\theta}{r}$. In the remaining part of the proof of this lemma, we will use a subscript y to denote the derivatives with respect to y.

It is clear that

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla^2\frac{\psi^\theta}{r} &= (\mathbf{e}_r\partial_r+\frac{1}{r}\mathbf{e}_\theta\partial_\theta+\mathbf{e}_z\partial_z)\big(\mathbf{e}_r\partial_r\frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\big)+\nabla\partial_z\frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\otimes\mathbf{e}_z\\ &= \mathbf{e}_r\otimes\mathbf{e}_r\partial_r^2\frac{\psi^\theta}{r}+\mathbf{e}_\theta\otimes\mathbf{e}_\theta\frac{1}{r}\partial_r\frac{\psi^\theta}{r}+(\mathbf{e}_z\otimes\mathbf{e}_r+\mathbf{e}_r\otimes\mathbf{e}_z)\partial_{zr}^2\frac{\psi^\theta}{r}+\mathbf{e}_z\otimes\mathbf{e}_z\partial_z^2\frac{\psi^\theta}{r}.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, one has

$$\big|\nabla^2\frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\big|^2\simeq\big|\partial_r^2\frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\big|^2+\big|\frac{1}{r}\partial_r\frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\big|^2+\big|\partial_z^2\frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\big|^2+\big|\partial_{rz}^2\frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\big|^2. \tag{3.6}$$

On the other hand, one also has

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_y^2\frac{\psi^\theta}{r} &= (\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_r\partial_r+\nabla_\theta+\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_z\partial_z)\big(\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_r\partial_r\frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\big)+\nabla_y\partial_z\frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\otimes\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_z\\ &= \widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_r\otimes\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_r\partial_r^2\frac{\psi^\theta}{r}+\nabla_\theta\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_r\partial_r\frac{\psi^\theta}{r}+(\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_z\otimes\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_r+\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_r\otimes\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_z)\partial_{zr}^2\frac{\psi^\theta}{r}+\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_z\otimes\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_z\partial_z^2\frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\\ &= \widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_r\otimes\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_r\partial_r^2\frac{\psi^\theta}{r}+(I_0-\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_r\otimes\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_r)\frac{1}{r}\partial_r\frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\\ &\quad+(\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_z\otimes\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_r+\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_r\otimes\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_z)\partial_{zr}^2\frac{\psi^\theta}{r}+\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_z\otimes\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_z\partial_z^2\frac{\psi^\theta}{r}.\end{aligned}$$

where $I_0=\begin{pmatrix}I_{4\times4} & 0\\ 0 & 0\end{pmatrix}$ and ∇_θ is defined by

$$\nabla_\theta=\nabla-\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_r(\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_r\cdot\nabla_y)-\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_z\partial_z,\quad \widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_r=\frac{1}{r}\begin{pmatrix}y_1\\y_2\\y_3\\y_4\\0\end{pmatrix},\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_z=\begin{pmatrix}0\\0\\0\\0\\1\end{pmatrix}.$$

Clearly, $\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_r \otimes \widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_r$, $I_0 - \widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_r \otimes \widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_r$, $\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_z \otimes \widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_r$, $\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_r \otimes \widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_z$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_z \otimes \widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_z$ are all mutually orthogonal. Consequently, one also has

$$\big|\nabla_y^2 \frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\big|^2 \simeq \big|\partial_r^2 \frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\big|^2 + \big|\frac{1}{r}\partial_r \frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\big|^2 + \big|\partial_z^2 \frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\big|^2 + \big|\partial_{rz}^2 \frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\big|^2. \tag{3.7}$$

By (3.6) and (3.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int \big|\nabla^2 \frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\big|^p dx &\simeq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\int_0^\infty \Big(\big|\partial_r^2 \frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\big|^2 + \big|\frac{1}{r}\partial_r \frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\big|^2 + \big|\partial_z^2 \frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\big|^2 + \big|\partial_{rz}^2 \frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\big|^2\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}} r dr dz \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\int_0^\infty \Big(\big|\partial_r^2 \frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\big|^2 + \big|\frac{1}{r}\partial_r \frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\big|^2 + \big|\partial_z^2 \frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\big|^2 + \big|\partial_{rz}^2 \frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\big|^2\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}} w(r) r^3 dr dz \\
&\simeq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\int_0^\infty \big|\nabla_y^2 \frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\big|^p w(r) r^3 dr dz \\
&\simeq \int \big|\nabla_y^2 (-\Delta_y)^{-1} \frac{\omega^\theta}{r}\big|^p w(r) dy,
\end{aligned}$$

where $w(r)$ is a weight function $w(r) = \frac{1}{r^2}$.

Let $1 < p < \infty$. Using Lemma 2 in [7] (see also a general version in Lemma 5.1 in Appendix of this paper), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int \big|\nabla_y^2 (-\Delta_y)^{-1} \frac{\omega^\theta}{r}\big|^p w(r) dy &\lesssim \int \big|\frac{\omega^\theta}{r}\big|^p w(r) dy \\
&\simeq \int \big|\frac{\omega^\theta}{r}\big|^p dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, one has

$$\int \big|\nabla^2 \frac{\psi^\theta}{r}\big|^p dx \lesssim \int \big|\frac{\omega^\theta}{r}\big|^p dx. \tag{3.8}$$

Repeating the above procedure, one also has

$$\int \big|\nabla^2 \frac{\partial_z \psi^\theta}{r}\big|^p dx \lesssim \int \big|\frac{\partial_z \omega^\theta}{r}\big|^p dx. \tag{3.9}$$

Taking $p = 2$ in (3.8) and (3.9) and using the interpolation inequality $\|f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|\nabla f\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla^2 f\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T \big\|r^{-1} u^r(t,\cdot)\big\|_{L^\infty} dt &= \int_0^T \big\|r^{-1} \partial_z \psi^\theta(t,\cdot)\big\|_{L^\infty} dt \\
&\lesssim \int_0^T \big\|\nabla \partial_z (r^{-1}\psi^\theta(t,\cdot))\big\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \big\|\nabla^2 \partial_z (r^{-1}\psi^\theta(t,\cdot))\big\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} dt \\
&\lesssim \sup_{0\le t\le T} \|\Omega(t,\cdot))\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^T \|\partial_z \Omega(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} dt.
\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of the lemma. □

Now we derive an L^∞ estimate for B^θ. Ignoring the viscosity in the equation of B^θ in (2.6), one has

$$\|B^\theta(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \quad \le \quad \|B_0^\theta\|_{L^\infty} + \int_0^t \|B^\theta(s,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \|\frac{u^r}{r}\|_{L^\infty} ds.$$

By Gronwall's inequality and using (3.3) and Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\|B^\theta(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \le \|B_0^\theta\|_{L^\infty} e^{\int_0^t \|r^{-1}\partial_z u^r(s,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty} ds} \lesssim e^{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}. \tag{3.10}$$

Let us coming back to (2.8) and estimate that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int |\omega^\theta|^2 dx + \int \big(|\nabla \omega^\theta|^2 + \frac{|\omega^\theta|^2}{r^2}\big) dx \\
&\le \|\frac{u^r}{r}\|_{L^\infty} \int (\omega^\theta)^2 dx + \|\Pi\|_{L^\infty} \|B^\theta\|_{L^2} \|\partial_z \omega^\theta\|_{L^2} \\
&\le \|\frac{u^r}{r}\|_{L^\infty} \int (\omega^\theta)^2 dx + \frac{1}{2}\|\Pi\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|B^\theta\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\partial_z \omega^\theta\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling the following basic energy law

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\big(\|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathbf{B}\|_{L^2}^2\big) + \int_0^t \big(\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{B}\|_{L^2}^2\big) ds = 0, \tag{3.11}$$

and using the *a priori* estimate in (3.3) and Lemma 3.1, one has

$$\|\nabla \times \mathbf{u}(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2} \lesssim e^{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}, \qquad \int_0^t \|\nabla(\nabla \times \mathbf{u})\|_{L^2}^2 dt \lesssim e^{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}, \quad \forall\, t \ge 0. \tag{3.12}$$

The next step is to bootstrap the regularity of $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{B}$. We are going to show the $L^1([0,T], \mathrm{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^3))$ estimate of $\mathbf{u}$. We will make use of the structure of the ideal MHD in (2.6) to avoid some possible technical complications. The key observation is that we can write the vorticity equation as

$$\partial_t(\nabla \times \mathbf{u}) + \nabla \cdot [(\nabla \times \mathbf{u}) \times \mathbf{u}] = \Delta(\nabla \times \mathbf{u}) - \partial_z(\Pi B^\theta e_\theta).$$

Here by the maximum principle in Proposition 2.1 and (3.10), one has $\Pi B^\theta \in L^\infty([0,t], L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))$. Moreover, we can apply (3.12) to bootstrap the regularity of $(\nabla \times \mathbf{u}) \times \mathbf{u}$. Then we may apply the standard parabolic estimate to get the $L^\infty([0,t], L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))$ estimate for $\nabla \times \mathbf{u}$.

We first perform L^4 energy estimate for (4.4) and derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{4}\frac{d}{dt}\int |\omega^\theta|^4 dx + \int \big(|\nabla |\omega^\theta|^2|^2 + \frac{|\omega^\theta|^4}{r^2}\big) dx \\
&\le \|\frac{u^r}{r}\|_{L^\infty} \int (\omega^\theta)^4 dx + \|\Pi\|_{L^\infty} \|B^\theta\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_z |\omega^\theta|^2\|_{L^2} \|\omega^\theta\|_{L^2} \\
&\le \|\frac{u^r}{r}\|_{L^\infty} \int (\omega^\theta)^4 dx + \frac{1}{2}\|\Pi\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|B^\theta\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\omega^\theta\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\partial_z |\omega^\theta|\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the *a priori* estimate in (3.3) and Lemma 3.1, one has

$$\||\omega^\theta|^2\|_{L^\infty([0,t],L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))}^2 + \|\nabla |\omega^\theta|^2\|_{L^2([0,t],L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))}^2 \lesssim e^{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}.$$

By interpolation inequality, one has

$$\|\omega^\theta\|_{L^\infty([0,t],L^4(\mathbb{R}^3))} + \|\omega^\theta\|_{L^4([0,t],L^{12}(\mathbb{R}^3))} \lesssim e^{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}.$$

On the other hand, by Sobolev imbedding, one also has

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty([0,t],L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))} \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty([0,t],L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))} + \|\omega^\theta\|_{L^\infty([0,t],L^4(\mathbb{R}^3))} \lesssim e^{t^{\frac{2}{3}}}.$$

Hence, we have

$$\|(\nabla \times \mathbf{u}) \times \mathbf{u}\|_{L^4([0,t],L^{12}(\mathbb{R}^3))} \lesssim e^{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}.$$

Write

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{u} = e^{t\Delta}\nabla \times \mathbf{u}_0 - \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta}\big(\nabla \cdot [(\nabla \times \mathbf{u}) \times \mathbf{u}] + \partial_z(\Pi B^\theta e_\theta)\big)ds.$$

A standard parabolic estimate gives that

$$\|\nabla\nabla \times \mathbf{u}\|_{L^4([0,t],L^{12}(\mathbb{R}^3))} \lesssim e^{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}.$$

By Sobolev imbedding, we have

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^4([0,t],L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))} \lesssim e^{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}. \tag{3.13}$$

Now let us derive the $L^1([0,T],\mathrm{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^3))$ estimate of $\mathbf{B}$. We first write

$$\partial_t \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{B} = \frac{u^r}{r}\mathbf{B}.$$

Applying ∇, one has

$$\partial_t \nabla \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla\nabla \mathbf{B} = -\nabla \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{B} + \frac{u^r}{r}\nabla \mathbf{B} + \nabla u^r \Pi \mathbf{e}_\theta + (\nabla \frac{1}{r})u^r \mathbf{B}.$$

Note that

$$(\nabla \frac{1}{r})u^r \mathbf{B} = -\frac{u^r}{r}\Pi \mathbf{e}_r,$$

one has

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla \mathbf{B}(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \quad &\lesssim \quad \|\nabla \mathbf{B}_0\|_{L^\infty} + \int_0^t \big(\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty} + \|\frac{u^r}{r}\|_{L^\infty}\big)\|\nabla \mathbf{B}(s,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty} ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \big(\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty} + \|\frac{u^r}{r}\|_{L^\infty}\big)\|\Pi(s,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty} ds.\end{aligned}$$

We can use (3.3), (3.13), Lemma 3.1 and Gronwall's inequality to estimate that

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{B}(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim e^{e^{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}}. \tag{3.14}$$

The *a priori* estimates (3.13) and (3.14) are enough for the global regularity of the ideal MHD equations (1.5). Indeed, applying the standard H^2 energy estimate, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\big(\|\nabla^2\mathbf{u}(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla^2\mathbf{B}(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2}^2\big)+\|\nabla^3\mathbf{u}(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2}^2\\
&\lesssim\int\big(-\nabla^2\mathbf{u}\nabla^2(\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{u})+\nabla^2\mathbf{u}\nabla^2(\mathbf{B}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{B})\big)dx\\
&\quad+\int\big(-\nabla^2\mathbf{B}\nabla^2(\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{B})+\nabla^2\mathbf{B}\nabla^2(\mathbf{B}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{u})\big)dx\\
&\lesssim\frac{1}{2}\|\nabla^3\mathbf{u}(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2}^2+\|\mathbf{u}(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty}^2\|\nabla^2\mathbf{u}(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2}^2+\|\mathbf{B}(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty}^2\|\nabla^2\mathbf{B}(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2}^2\\
&\quad+\big(\|\nabla\mathbf{u}(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty}+\|\nabla\mathbf{B}(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty}\big)\big(\|\nabla^2\mathbf{B}(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla^2\mathbf{u}(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2}^2\big).
\end{aligned}$$

Here we also used the Gagliardo-Nirenberg's inequality $\|\nabla f\|_{L^4}^2\lesssim\|f\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla^2 f\|_{L^2}$, the integration by parts and $\int\nabla^2\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla)\nabla^2\mathbf{B}dx=0$. Consequently, one has

$$\begin{cases}\|\nabla^2\mathbf{u}(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2}+\|\nabla^2\mathbf{B}(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2}\lesssim e^{e^{e^{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}}}, \\ \int_0^t\|\nabla^3\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2}^2dt\lesssim e^{e^{e^{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}}},\end{cases}\qquad\forall\ t\geq 0.$$

We finished the proof of Theorem 1.5. □

4 Proofs of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Similarly as in obtaining (3.1), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|\Omega\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla\Omega\|_{L^2}^2 &\lesssim \Big|\int\Omega\partial_z\Pi^2dx\Big|\\
&\leq \|\Pi\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\Pi\|_{L^{\frac{10}{3}}}^{\frac{5}{3}}\|\partial_z\Omega\|_{L^2}\\
&\lesssim \|\Pi\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\Pi\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2}{3}}\|\nabla\Pi\|_{L^2}\|\partial_z\Omega\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, one has

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\Omega\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla\Omega\|_{L^2}^2\lesssim\|\Pi\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{2}{3}}\|\Pi\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4}{3}}\|\nabla\Pi\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{4.1}$$

Applying a similar argument to Π equation in (2.11), one has

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\Pi\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla\Pi\|_{L^2}^2\leq 0. \tag{4.2}$$

Clearly, the combination of (4.1), (4.2) and the maximum estimate in Proposition 2.1 gives the following *a priori* estimate

$$\|\Pi(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2}+\|\Omega(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2}\lesssim 1\ \ (\forall\ t\geq 0),\quad\int_0^\infty\big(\|\nabla\Pi\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla\Omega\|_{L^2}^2\big)dt\lesssim 1. \tag{4.3}$$

Now let us come back to the equation of ω^θ in (2.8). Applying the standard energy estimate, one has

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int|\omega^\theta|^2dx+\int\big(|\nabla\omega^\theta|^2+\frac{|\omega^\theta|^2}{r^2}\big)dx\\&=\int\frac{u^r(\omega^\theta)^2}{r}dx-\int\frac{\partial_z(B^\theta)^2}{r}\omega^\theta dx.\end{aligned}\tag{4.4}$$

Using Sobolev imbedding theorem and interpolation, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\int\frac{u^r(\omega^\theta)^2}{r}dx\Big| &\leq \|u^r\|_{L^2}\|\Omega\|_{L^6}\|\omega^\theta\|_{L^3}\\&\lesssim \|u^r\|_{L^2}\|\nabla\Omega\|_{L^2}\|\omega^\theta\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla\omega^\theta\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\\&\lesssim \|u^r\|_{L^2}^2\|\nabla\Omega\|_{L^2}^2+\|\omega^\theta\|_{L^2}^2+\frac{1}{4}\|\nabla\omega^\theta\|_{L^2}^2.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, it is clear that one also has

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\int\frac{\partial_z(B^\theta)^2}{r}\omega^\theta dx\Big| &\leq \|\Pi\|_{L^\infty}\|B^\theta\|_{L^2}\|\partial_z\omega^\theta\|_{L^2}\\&\leq \|\Pi\|_{L^\infty}^2\|B^\theta\|_{L^2}^2+\frac{1}{4}\|\partial_z\omega^\theta\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Using the *a priori* estimate (4.3), the basic energy law (3.11) and Proposition 2.1, we have

$$\|\nabla\times\mathbf{u}(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2}\lesssim 1\quad(\forall\ t\geq 0),\qquad \int_0^\infty\|\nabla(\nabla\times\mathbf{u})\|_{L^2}^2)dt\lesssim 1.\tag{4.5}$$

The *a priori* estimate (4.5) is enough to get the global regularity of the resistive MHD (1.6). Indeed, by using the equation of $\mathbf{B}$, one can easily verifies that $\nabla\mathbf{B}$ also satisfies (4.5). We have finished the proof of Theorem 1.2. □

Next, let us present the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Proof. We first consider the following resistive MHD with ϵ fluid diffusion which will serve as the regularized system of (1.7):

$$\begin{cases}\partial_t\mathbf{u}+(\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{u}+\nabla p=\epsilon\Delta\mathbf{u}+(\nabla\times\mathbf{B})\times\mathbf{B},\\ \partial_t\mathbf{B}=\Delta\mathbf{B}+\nabla\times(\mathbf{u}\times\mathbf{B}),\\ \nabla\cdot\mathbf{u}=0,\quad \nabla\cdot\mathbf{B}=0.\end{cases}\tag{4.6}$$

To impose an initial data for (4.6), we choose two non-negative mollifiers $\phi_1\in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and $\phi_2\in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that

$$\int\phi_1(z)dz=\int\phi_2(x_1,x_2)dx_1dx_2=1,\quad \phi_2\text{ is symmetric.}$$

Denote $x=(x_1,x_2,z)$, $y=(y_1,y_2,z')$ and define

$$\mathcal{J}_\epsilon f(x)=\epsilon^{-3}\int\phi_1(\epsilon^{-1}z')\phi_2(\epsilon^{-2}y_1,\epsilon^{-2}y_2)f(x-y)dy.$$

For given initial data $\mathbf{u}_0$ and $\mathbf{B}_0$ as in Theorem 1.3, define

$$\mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon = r[\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(r^{-1}u_0^r)]\mathbf{e}_r + (\mathcal{J}_\epsilon u_0^z)\mathbf{e}_z, \quad \mathbf{B}_0^\epsilon = r[\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(r^{-1}B_0^\theta)]\mathbf{e}_\theta. \tag{4.7}$$

Clearly, due to our choice of $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon$, the regularized data in (4.7) is also axially symmetric. Since $\mathbf{u}_0 \in H^2$, one has $r^{-1}u_0^r = -\partial_r u_0^r - \partial_z u_0^z \in H^1$. Moreover, since

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|\nabla\big(r[\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(r^{-1}u_0^r)]\mathbf{e}_r\big)\big|^2 &= \big|\nabla\big(r[\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(r^{-1}u_0^r)]\big)\big|^2 + \big|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(r^{-1}u_0^r)\big|^2 \\
&\lesssim \big|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(r^{-1}u_0^r)\big|^2 + \big|r\nabla[\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(r^{-1}u_0^r)]\big|^2 \\
&\lesssim \big|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(r^{-1}u_0^r)\big|^2 + \Big|r\nabla\int \mathcal{J}_\epsilon(x-y)(|r_y|^{-1}u_0^r)1_{r_y\le\frac{r_x}{2}}dy\Big|^2 \\
&\quad + \Big|r\nabla\int \mathcal{J}_\epsilon(x-y)(r^{-1}u_0^r)1_{r_y>\frac{r_x}{2}}]dy\Big|^2 \\
&\lesssim \big|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(r^{-1}u_0^r)\big|^2 + \big|\big(r\nabla\mathcal{J}_\epsilon\big)(|r|^{-1}|u_0^r|)\big|^2 + \big|\nabla\mathcal{J}_\epsilon|u_0^r|\big|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

one has $\mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon \in H^1$ for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$. Here we used the notation $r_p = \sqrt{p_1^2 + p_2^2}$ for a point $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Similarly, one also has $\mathbf{B}_0^\epsilon \in H^1$ for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$. It is obvious that $\frac{\mathbf{B}_0^\epsilon}{r} \in L^\infty$. Hence, all the assumptions on the initial data in Theorem 1.2 are satisfied by $\mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon$ and ${\mathbf{B}_\mathbf{0}}^\epsilon$. We can then apply Theorem 1.2 to conclude that there exists a unique global smooth solution $(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon, \mathbf{B}^\epsilon)$ to (4.6) for each $\epsilon > 0$.

We are going to take the limit $\epsilon \to 0+$. Note that for each fixed $\epsilon > 0$, by energy estimate, one has the following *a priori* estimate

$$\begin{cases}
\|(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon, \mathbf{B}^\epsilon)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|(\mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon, \mathbf{B}_0^\epsilon)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|(\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{B}_0)\|_{H^1}, \\
\|\nabla\mathbf{B}^\epsilon\|_{L^2([0,\infty],L^2)} \lesssim \|(\mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon, \mathbf{B}_0^\epsilon)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|(\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{B}_0)\|_{H^1},
\end{cases} \tag{4.8}$$

which are independent of ϵ. Moreover, since

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|\Pi^\epsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\Pi^\epsilon\|_{L^2}^2 = 0,$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\Omega^\epsilon\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}}^{\frac{3}{2}} \le -2\int |\Omega^\epsilon|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Omega^\epsilon\partial_z(\Pi^\epsilon)^2 dx \le \|\Omega^\epsilon\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\Pi^\epsilon\|_{L^6}\|\partial_z\Pi^\epsilon\|_{L^2},$$

one also has

$$\begin{cases}
\|\Pi^\epsilon\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\Pi^\epsilon\|_{L^2([0,\infty),L^2)} \lesssim \|\Pi_0^\epsilon\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|B_0\|_{H^1}, \\
\|\Omega^\epsilon\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}} \lesssim \|\Omega_0^\epsilon\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \|\nabla\Pi^\epsilon\|_{L^2([0,\infty),L^2)}^2 \lesssim C,
\end{cases} \tag{4.9}$$

for a positive constant depending on $\|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{H^2}$ and $\|\mathbf{B}_0\|_{H^1}$, but independent of ϵ. Note that $\Omega_0^\epsilon = \frac{(\omega_0^\epsilon)^\theta}{r} = \partial_z[\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(r^{-1}u_0^r)] - \frac{\partial_r(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon u_0^z)}{r} \in W^{2,\frac{3}{2}}$ by Hardy inequality.

For any $R > 0$ and any vector $\phi \in C_0^\infty(B_R)$ with $\nabla \cdot \phi = 0$, taking $\psi \in C_0^\infty(B_{3R})$ with

$\psi \equiv 1$ on B_{2R}, and using (4.8), (4.9) and (4.6), we can estimate that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon \phi dx &= -\int \psi(\nabla \times \mathbf{u}^\epsilon) \times \mathbf{u}^\epsilon \mathcal{R}\phi dx + \int (\nabla \times \mathbf{B}^\epsilon) \times \mathbf{B}^\epsilon \mathcal{R}\phi dx \\
&\quad - \int (1-\psi)(\nabla \times \mathbf{u}^\epsilon) \times \mathbf{u}^\epsilon \mathcal{R}\phi dx \\
&= -\int \psi r \Omega^\epsilon \mathbf{e}^\epsilon \times \mathbf{u}^\epsilon \mathcal{R}\phi dx + \int (\nabla \times \mathbf{B}^\epsilon) \times \mathbf{B}^\epsilon \mathcal{R}\phi dx \\
&\quad + \int (1-\psi)\mathbf{u}^\epsilon \otimes \mathbf{u}^\epsilon : \nabla \mathcal{R}\phi dx + \int \mathbf{u}^\epsilon \otimes \mathbf{u}^\epsilon : \nabla(1-\psi) \otimes \mathcal{R}\phi dx \\
&\leq 3R\|\Omega^\epsilon\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}} \|(1-\psi)\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^6} \|\phi\|_{L^6} + \|\nabla \mathbf{B}^\epsilon\|_{L^2} \|\mathbf{B}^\epsilon\|_{L^6} \|\phi\|_{L^3} \\
&\quad + \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \Big\| \int_{|x-y|>2R} |x-y|^{-4} |\phi(y)| dy \Big\|_{L^2} + \|\mathbf{u}^\epsilon \otimes \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^2(B_{2R})} \|\phi\|_{L^2} \\
&\lesssim \big(R + \|\nabla \mathbf{B}^\epsilon\|_{L^2}^2\big) \|\phi\|_{H^1}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Consequently, one can derive that

$$\|\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\|_{L^1_t H^{-1}(B_R)} \lesssim C_R.$$

Similarly, one also has

$$\|\partial_t \mathbf{B}^\epsilon\|_{L^1_t H^{-1}(B_R)} \lesssim C_R.$$

Using the standard compactness theorem (see, for instance, [16]), one has

$$(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon, \mathbf{B}^\epsilon) \longrightarrow (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{B}) \ \text{ in } \ L^3([0,\infty), L^3_{\text{local}})$$

for a sequence of $\epsilon \to 0$. By a diagonal argument, we get a subsequence of $(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon, \mathbf{B}^\epsilon)$ such that the above strong convergence is true for any $R > 0$. Let $\eta(t,\cdot) \in C^1([0,\infty), C_0^\infty)$ be an arbitrary test function with $\nabla \cdot \eta(t,x) = 0$. We write the resistive MHD system in the following weak form

$$
\begin{cases}
\iint \mathbf{u}^\epsilon(\partial_t \eta + (\mathbf{u}^\epsilon \cdot \nabla)\eta + \epsilon \Delta \eta) - (\mathbf{B}^\epsilon \cdot \nabla \eta)\mathbf{B}^\epsilon dxdt = 0, \\
\iint \mathbf{B}^\epsilon(\partial_t \eta + (\mathbf{u}^\epsilon \cdot \nabla)\eta + \Delta \eta) - (\mathbf{B}^\epsilon \cdot \nabla \eta)\mathbf{u}^\epsilon dxdt = 0, \\
\iint \mathbf{B}^\epsilon \cdot \nabla \eta dxdt = 0.
\end{cases}
$$

Clearly, by taking the limit $\epsilon \to 0+$, one has

$$
\begin{cases}
\iint \mathbf{u}(\partial_t \eta + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\eta - (\mathbf{B} \cdot \nabla \eta)\mathbf{B} dxdt = 0, \\
\iint \mathbf{B}(\partial_t \eta + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\eta + \Delta \eta) - (\mathbf{B} \cdot \nabla \eta)\mathbf{u} dxdt = 0, \\
\iint \mathbf{B} \cdot \nabla \eta dxdt = 0.
\end{cases}
$$

Since η is divergence and arbitrary, one concludes that there exists a distribution p such that $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{B}, p)$ satisfies (1.7) in the sense of distribution with the initial given data and $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{B}) \in L^\infty(0,\infty; L^2)$, $\nabla \mathbf{B} \in L^2(0,\infty; L^2)$.

□

5 Appendix

In this appendix we first prove that $w(y) = r^\alpha$ is a $\mathcal{A}_p$ for Riesz operator in $\mathbb{R}^5$ under $-4 < \alpha < 4p\big(1 - \frac{1}{p}\big)$. The case of $\alpha = -2$ has been studied in [7].

Lemma 5.1 ($\mathcal{A}_p$ Weight)**.** *Let* $1 < p < \infty$ *and* $w(y) = r^\alpha$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^5$. *Then* $w(x)$ *is in* $\mathcal{A}_p$ *class if* $-4 < \alpha < 4p\big(1 - \frac{1}{p}\big)$.

Proof. Recall that a real valued non-negative function $w(x)$ is said to be in $\mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ class if it satisfies

$$\sup_{B \subset \mathbb{R}^n} \Big(\frac{1}{|B|}\int_B w(x)dx\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{|B|}\int_B w(x)^{-\frac{q}{p}}dx\Big)^{\frac{p}{q}} < \infty.$$

Here p and q are conjugate indices with $1 < p < \infty$.

For any ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^5$, denote $B = B(y_0, R)$. It is easy to see that if $r_0 > 2R$, one has $r \simeq r_0$ for any $x \in B$. Consequently, for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big(\frac{1}{|B|}\int_B w(x)dx\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{|B|}\int_B w(x)^{-\frac{q}{p}}dx\Big)^{\frac{p}{q}} \\
&\lesssim \Big(\frac{1}{|B|}\int_B r_0^\alpha dx\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{|B|}\int_B r_0^{-\frac{q}{p}\alpha}dx\Big)^{\frac{p}{q}} \lesssim 1.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if $r_0 \le 2R$, then for $\alpha + 3 > -1$ and $-\frac{q\alpha}{p} + 3 > -1$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big(\frac{1}{|B|}\int_B w(x)dx\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{|B|}\int_B w(x)^{-\frac{q}{p}}dx\Big)^{\frac{p}{q}} \\
&\lesssim \Big(\frac{1}{R^5}\int_{r_0-R}^{r_0+R}dz\int_0^{3R} r^{\alpha+3}dr\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{R^5}\int_{r_0-R}^{r_0+R}dz\int_0^{3R} r^{-\frac{q\alpha}{p}+3}dr\Big)^{\frac{p}{q}} \\
&\lesssim R^\alpha R^{-\alpha} = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Noting that the condition on α is $-4 < \alpha < 4p\big(1 - \frac{1}{p}\big)$, we in fact have completed the proof of the lemma. ☐

Next, let us provide a simpler proof of Theorem 1.1 under an extra condition on the initial data $\Omega_0 \in L^{3+\delta}$.

Theorem 5.2. *Suppose that all the assumptions in Theorem 1.1 are satisfied. Furthermore, if* $\Omega_0 \in L^{3+\delta}$ *for some* $\delta > 0$*, then there exists a unique global solution* $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{B})$ *for the ideal MHD* (1.6) *with the initial data* $(\mathbf{u_0}, \mathbf{B}_0)$ *which satisfies*

$$\|\mathbf{u}(t,\cdot)\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\mathbf{B}(t,\cdot)\|_{H^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{H^2}^2 ds \lesssim e^{e^{e^{t^{\frac{3}{2}}}}}.$$

Proof. We of course still have the *a priori* estimate (3.3). On the other hand, by multiplying the equation of Ω by $|\Omega|^{1+\delta}\Omega$ and then preform the standard energy estimate as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\|\Omega\|_{L^{3+\delta}}^{3+\delta} + \big\|\nabla|\Omega|^{\frac{3+\delta}{2}}\big\|_{L^2}^2 &\lesssim \Big|\int |\Omega|^{1+\delta}\Omega\partial_z\Pi^2 dx\Big\| \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla|\Omega|^{\frac{3+\delta}{2}}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Pi\|_{L^{\frac{8}{1-\delta}}}^4\|\Omega\|_{L^2}^{1+\delta} \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla|\Omega|^{\frac{3+\delta}{2}}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Pi\|_{L^2}^{1-\delta}\|\Pi\|_{L^\infty}^{3+\delta}\|\Omega\|_{L^2}^{1+\delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using (3.3), one has

$$\|\Omega(t,\cdot)\|_{L^{3+\delta}} \lesssim 1 + t^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \forall\, t \geq 0. \tag{5.1}$$

Now let us recall a Biot-Savart law (see [15]):

$$|u^r(t,x)| \lesssim \int_{|y-x|\leq 4r} \frac{|\omega^\theta(t,y)|}{|x-y|^2}dy + r\int_{|y-x|\geq 4r} \frac{|\omega^\theta(t,y)|}{|x-y|^3}dy.$$

Here $y = (y_1, y_2, z')$. Denote $r' = \sqrt{y_1^2 + y_2^2}$. One has

$$|u^r(t,r,z)| \lesssim \int_{|y-x|\leq 4r} \frac{|\omega^\theta(t,y)|}{r'}\frac{r'}{|x-y|^2}dy + r\int_{|y-x|\geq 4r} \frac{|\omega^\theta(t,y)|}{r'}\frac{r'}{|x-y|^3}dy.$$

Note that $r' \leq |r - r'| + r \leq |x-y| + r$. Hence, if $|x-y| \leq 4r$, one has $r' \leq 5r$, and if $|x-y| > 4r$, one has $r' \leq 2|x-y|$. Consequently, by Young's inequality, we have

$$|u^r(t,r,z)| \lesssim r\frac{1}{|x|^2} * \Omega \leq r\Big\|\frac{1}{|x|^2}\Big\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2},\infty}}\|\Omega\|_{L^{3,1}}.$$

Here $L^{p,q}$ denotes the usual Lorentz norm which is defined as

$$\|f\|_{L^{p,q}} = \Big(\int_0^\infty \big(t|\{x : |f(x)| > t\}|^{\frac{1}{p}}\big)^q\frac{dt}{t}\Big)^{\frac{1}{q}}, \quad L^{p,\infty} = L^p_*,\ L^{p,p} = L^p.$$

Noting that

$$\Big\|\frac{1}{|x|^2}\Big\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2},\infty}} = \sup_{t>0} t|\{x : \frac{1}{|x|^2} > t\}|^{\frac{2}{3}} \lesssim 1,$$

and using the real interpolation and (3.3), (5.1), we have

$$\Big|\frac{u^r(t,r,z)}{r}\Big| \lesssim \|\Omega\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2\delta}{3(1+\delta)}}\|\Omega\|_{L^{3+\delta}}^{\frac{3+\delta}{3(1+\delta)}} \lesssim 1 + t^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{5.2}$$

Using (5.2), the remaining proof can be carried out similarly as in section 3. □

Acknowledgement

Part of this work was done when Zhen Lei was visiting the Courant Institute of New York University and the Department of Mathematics of Harvard University during 2012. He would like to thank the institutes for the hospitality. The author was also supported by NSFC (grant No.11171072), the Foundation for Innovative Research Groups of NSFC (grant No.11121101), FANEDD, Shanghai Rising Star Program (grant No.10QA1400300), Innovation Program of Shanghai Municipal Education Commission (grant No.12ZZ012) and SGST 09DZ2272900.

References

[1] R. Caflisch, I. Klapper and G. Steele, *Remarks on singularities, dimension and energy dissipation for ideal hydrodynamics and MHD*, Comm. Math. Phys. 184 (1997) 443–455.

[2] C Cao and J. Wu, *Global regularity for the 2D MHD equations with mixed partial dissipation and magnetic diffusion.* Adv. Math. 226 (2011), no. 2, 1803–1822.

[3] Q. Chen, C. Miao and Z. Zhang, *On the regularity criterion of weak solution for the 3D viscous magneto-hydrodynamics equations.* Comm. Math. Phys. 284 (2008), no. 3, 919–930.

[4] C. Chiuderi and F. Califano, *Resistivity-independent dissipation of magnetohydrodynamic waves in an inhomogeneous*, Phys. Rev. E 60, 4701–4707 (1999).

[5] C. He and X. Xin, *Partial regularity of suitable weak solutions to the incompressible magnetohydrodynamic equations*, J. Funct. Anal., **227** (2005), 113–152.

[6] C. He and X. Xin, *On the regularity of weak solutions to the magnetohydrodynamic equations*, J. Differential Equations, **213** (2005), 235–254.

[7] T. Hou, Z. Lei and C. Li, *Global regularity of the 3D axi-symmetric Navier-Stokes equations with anisotropic data.* Comm. Partial Differential Equations 33 (2008), no. 7-9, 1622–1637.

[8] O. A. Ladyzhenskaja, *Unique global solvability of the three-dimensional Cauchy problem for the Navier-Stokes equations in the presence of axial symmetry.* Zapiski Nauchnykh Seminarov Leningrad Otdelenie. Matematicheski. Institut im. V. A. Steklova (LOMI) 7 (1968): 155–77 (Russian).

[9] L. D. Laudau and E. M. Lifshitz: *Electrodynamics of Continuous Media*, 2nd ed. Pergamon, New York, 1984.

[10] Z. Lei and Y. Zhou, *BKM's criterion and global weak solutions for magnetohydrodynamics with zero viscosity*, DCDS-A, 25 (2009), no. 2, 575–583.

[11] F.-H. Lin, L. Xu and P. Zhang, *Global small solutions to 2-D incompressible MHD system*, preprint.

[12] A. Majda and Andrea L. Bertozzi, *Vorticity and incompressible flow.* Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics, 27. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.

[13] M. Sermange and R. Temam, *Some mathematical questions related to the mhd equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **36** (1983), 635–664.

[14] E. M. Stein, *Harmonic Analysis: Real-Variable Methods, Orthogonality, and Oscillatory Integrals.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

[15] T. Shirota and T. Yanagisawa, *Note on global existence for axially symmetric solutions of the Euler system.* Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci. **70** (1994), no. 10, 299–304.

[16] R. Temam, *Navier-Stokes equations. Theory and numerical analysis.* Reprint of the 1984 edition. AMS Chelsea Publishing, Providence, RI, 2001.

[17] M. R. Ukhovskii and V. I. Iudovich. *Axially symmetric flows of ideal and viscous fluids filling the whole space.* Journal of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics 32 (1968): 52–61.